



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Kremmling Field Office  
2103 E. Park Avenue, PO Box 68  
Kremmling, CO 80459



## RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #3

**Thursday, January 17, 2008 (5:00 – 8:00 PM)**

Meeting Location: Kremmling Chamber Building, 203 Park Avenue, Kremmling, CO

### SUMMARY NOTES

**Attendees:** Dave Costlow (whitewater rafting), Jim McDaniel (big game hunting permittee), Randy Miller (North Park Snow Snakes), Carol Petersen (grazing permittee), Jerry Stahl (Grand County Wilderness Group), Holly Whitten (hiking), John Monkouski (BLM), Dave Stout (BLM), Joe Stout (BLM), Andy Windsor (BLM), Angie Adams (EMPS, Inc.), Chad Ricklefs (Tetra Tech, Inc.), Mike Garriett (general public), Bill Fisher (general public), Randy Fosha (general public), Jerry Helmecke (general public).

#### Handouts:

- Agenda
- Initial Draft – Alternative Discussion for the Glenwood Springs and Kremmling Resource Management Plan Revisions (January 16, 2008)
- Draft Recreation Alternatives Matrix
- Draft SRMA Recreation Management Zones Maps:
  - Blue River – Alternative D
  - Headwaters – Alternative B
  - Headwaters – Alternative D
  - Laramie River – Alternative C
  - North Park – Alternative D
  - North Sand Hills – Alternatives B & D
  - North Sand Hills – Alternative C
  - Strawberry – Alternative B
  - Strawberry – Alternative C
  - Upper Colorado – Alternatives B, C, and D
  - Woford – Alternative B
  - Woford – Alternative D
- Draft Woford SRMA Management Strategy by Recreation Management Zone Matrix
- Trail Density Map

#### WELCOME

Joe Stout (BLM) and Angie Adams (EMPS, Inc.) welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation, which was followed by a round robin of introductions.

#### PLANNING UPDATES

- BLM has been working on the alternatives. Would like to have a draft of the alternatives completed in February 2008.

#### RMP ALTERNATIVE APPROACH DISCUSSION

- Handout: Initial Draft – Alternative Discussion for the Glenwood Springs and Kremmling Resource Management Plan Revisions (January 16, 2008)

- Joe Stout summarized the handout. BLM would like RAC Subcommittee to comment on the range of alternatives (see page 7). How should BLM balance recreation in the alternatives?

## REVISED SRMA TABLE WORK SESSION

- Handouts: Draft Recreation Alternatives Matrix; Draft SRMA Recreation Management Zones Maps (see list of maps above under “Handouts”); Draft Wolford SRMA Management Strategy by Recreation Management Zone Matrix; Trail Density Map
- Andy Windsor (BLM) made a PowerPoint presentation on Recreation Management. Goal of today’s presentation is to provide a brief overview the handout while highlighting changes that have been made to the matrix.
- Permitting process will also be discussed. Discuss difference between No Action (current management) Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) and ERMA in action alternatives. The format of the Draft RMP alternatives matrix will look different than what is presented today (see Draft Wolford SRMA Management Strategy by Recreation Management Zone Matrix).
- Wolford Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Three zones in Alternative B. Two motorized zones on east side and non-motorized zone on west side. High-intensity/density motorized development in Zone 1. Zone 2 would have less-dense trail system moving out, changes in skill challenges. Zone 3 would be the non-motorized zone.
  - Alternative C managed as an ERMA. Recreation not the primary emphasis.
- Discussed the change in the matrix format (see Draft Wolford SRMA Management Strategy by Recreation Management Zone Matrix):
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Where did the new format “Criteria for Classification and Participations” (replaced Recreation Opportunity Spectrum [ROS]) come from. BLM response: BLM Glenwood Springs Field Office requested that this format be used; BLM developed format.
  - Table shows the change that would take place throughout the life of the RMP. Management may include more people in certain areas to reduce impacts in other areas while still managing for other resources in those areas.
- Permit Discussion: The RMP must set permit allocations. Percentage of use in Resource Management Zones would be allocated to permitted use. As total user numbers grew, number of permits increases. This would be applied in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) only. Surplus user days would now be available for growth or current permit holders. Permit allocations need to match the appropriate “Social” setting for the area. RAC Subcommittee question: Does BLM have data to support 5 percent total visitation levels? BLM response: Five percent would not be for all areas. BLM would need to gather data on existing use in order to finalize this approach to permitting.
- Upper Colorado Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Alternative B is close to current management conditions.
  - Alternative C is conservation approach; restrict use. Facilities would be removed.
  - Alternative D would manage for additional use.
  - Does BLM need all three ranges of alternatives? RAC Subcommittee response: RMP should be adaptive to manage for the ebb and flows in recreation uses.
- Strawberry Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Alternative B, Zone 2 was switched with Zone 1 due to concerns with noise from motorized use.
  - Alternative C becomes one zone. SRMA with no motors.
  - Alternative D becomes the ERMA.
  - RAC Subcommittee comment: Need to get rid of zones and manage area as an SRMA. Should not shift current use from one area to another. Look at what sustainable trail experience is. BLM response: Under SRMA, BLM develops management outcomes (what use is the SRMA managed for).
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Are there BLM funds available to construct the infrastructure? BLM response: BLM would provide plans but community/user group would need to construct facilities. This is a great opportunity for a community based SRMA. Local ownership may lead to responsible use.
- North Sand Hills Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Difference between Alternatives B and D; less administrative controls in Alternative D.
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Would alternatives follow Jackson County Master Plan. BLM response: Most actions described in Master Plan would fit under Alternative D. From this report

BLM identified the need for management activities in the North Sand Hills area; but not to restrictive. BLM can not adopt this plan due to regulatory constrictions.

- Alternative B calls for administrative activities to collect fees in this area.
- North Park Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Alternative D is an SRMA. Alternatives B and C are ERMA's; manages dispersed recreation better.
- Headwaters Discussion (refer to draft recreation alternatives matrix for specific changes):
  - Alternative D includes two zones: non-motorized vs. motorized. Does include an undeveloped strategy.
  - Alternative C is now an ERMA; recreation would not be emphasized in the Headwaters.
  - Alternative B is now one zone (SRMA).
  - Public comment: Kinney Creek is a concern, this area should have more management. Zone 1 is okay as it is. BLM response: Forest Service would like to see both zones have limited motorized travel, Forest Service is reducing motorized use on their adjacent lands.
  - RAC Subcommittee comment: Black Mountain needs travel designations.
  - RAC Subcommittee comment: Use of partnerships to keep things in check.
  - BLM comment: Part of route designations would be to allow for administrative uses (i.e., fence maintenance, etc.); closed to public routes. Permittees would still have granted access.
  - Public comment: Concerned on daily cut backs of number of people allowed in areas per day. BLM response: If Alternatives B or D are adopted as they are currently described, allowable daily uses may be cut.
- Trail Density Map – Illustrates how trail density will be considered in alternatives development.
- RAC Subcommittee Discussion:
  - No action (current management) vs. action ERMA's: See Current Management Objective for ERMA for Blue River (see alternative matrix handout) for description of current ERMA's. Recreation would still occur under action ERMA's, but it would not be the primary use in these areas. Action ERMA's would manage recreation in a custodial manner.
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Is BLM developing a marketing approach for private users to help them develop recreation facilities? BLM response: BLM needs to partner with recreation providers to achieve the goals of BLM's recreation management directions. Marketing for BLM includes matching opportunities, not selling permits or telling people to come here. Partnerships with motorized interests are not common.
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Does the local Field Office get all of the money allocated from partnerships? BLM response: Yes, money from permits and commercial outfitters also stays in the Field Office.
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Where does recreation fit in BLM's management goals? BLM response: BLM is obligated to manage multiple resources.
  - RAC Subcommittee question: Can oil and gas development occur in an ERMA? BLM response: Within ERMA's recreation is not the primary resource; oil and gas development could occur in ERMA's.

#### **OTHER ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

- None.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT/QUESTIONS**

- None.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Next KFO RAC Subcommittee meetings are scheduled as follows (5:00pm – 8:00pm) (Kremmling Chamber Building):

- Monday, February 11, 2008. Topics will likely include Strawberry Hill SRMA discussion (continued from January 17, 2008 meeting).
- Thursday, February 21, 2008. Need RAC Subcommittee's overall buyoff on range of alternatives.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- ☐ For future meeting dates, see "Next Meeting" above.

CRR – January 17, 2008